

H

GU  
BE  
GAD  
ORA  
PEM

NO

# DOMINION ELECTION.

---

CAMPAIGN OF 1886.

---

## Hon. Edward Blake's Speeches.

---

No. 6, (First Series).

GUELPH—Home Rule for Ireland.

BERLIN—Tory attempt to excite Germans.

GALT—Indian Starvation Policy.

ORANGEVILLE—Indian Starvation Policy.

PEMBROKE—Maladministration felt at Cut Knife Hill.

NOTE.—See Inside Cover for List of Mr. Blake's Speeches in first Series. Apply to W. T. R. Preston, Reform Club, Toronto, for Copies of these Speeches.

Toronto:

HUNTER, ROSE & CO., PRINTERS.

1886.

## LIST OF SPEECHES IN THIS SERIES.

- No. 1.—(LONDON): **General Review of Situation. Riel Question.**  
                   (OWEN SOUND): **North-West Maladministration. Riel.**
- No. 2.—(BEAVERTON): **Independence of Parliament. The Boodle Brigade.**
- No. 3.—(CHESLEY): **Public Finances—Taxation and Deficits—Farmers.**
- No. 4.—(SIMCOE): **Federal and Provincial Rights—Ontario—Nova Scotia.**  
                   (GUELPH)—**Elections near.—Tory Dodges—Nova Scotia.**
- No. 5.—(OWEN SOUND): **Principles of Liberalism—Duty of the Leader.**  
                   (WELLAND)—**Policy of the Party—Functions of an Opposition.**  
                   (OAKWOOD)—**Sir J. Macdonald on Functions of an Opposition.**
- No. 6.—*Extracts*—(GUELPH): **Home Rule for Ireland.**  
                                   (BERLIN): **Firebrand Tory attempts to excite Germans.**  
                                   (GALT & ORANGEVILLE): **Indian Starvation Policy.**  
                                   (PEMBROKE): **Maladministration felt at Cut Knife Hill.**
- No. 7.—*Extracts*—(KENDALL): **Business Methods required in Public Affairs**  
                                   —**Degradation of Parliament—A few Boodlers.**  
                                   (HAMPTON): **Civil Service Reform.**  
                                   (GALT): **Burden of Public Debt.**  
                                   (ORANGEVILLE): **Burden of Public Debt.**  
                                   (BELLEVILLE): **Burden of Public Debt—The Interest on Debt.**  
                                   (OAKWOOD): **Burden of Public Debt—Our Public Expenditure.**
- No. 8.—(NEWCASTLE): **Canadian Pacific Railroad Matters.**  
                   (LISTOWEL): **Canadian Pacific Railroad Matters—The last Sacrifice of \$10,000,000—Collapse of Tory "Boom" Policy.**  
                   (ST. THOMAS): **North-West Lands.**  
                   (HUNTSVILLE): **R.R. Policy—Sir John's Subsidies to "Guinea-Pig" Directors—Assisted Immigration and Railway Frauds.**  
                   (PARRY SOUND): **Railway Policy of Liberals.**  
                   (ORANGEVILLE): **Railway Policy of Liberals.**  
                   (BRANTFORD): **The Kansas Slander.**  
                   (LISTOWEL): **The Sea of Mountains.**
- No. 9.—(WINGHAM): **Blake's Tribute to Mackenzie.**  
                   (STAYNER): **Blake's Tribute to Sir Richard Cartwright.**  
                   (BRANTFORD): **Blake's Tribute to Paterson—Duty of Young Men.**
- No. 10.—(WELLAND): **Liberal Party, Creeds and Classes.**  
                   (ORILLIA): **Leaders and Newspapers—The "Mail" Crusade.**
- No. 11.—(AYLMER): **Prohibition and Politics.**
- No. 12.—(TORONTO): **Interests of Labour—The Tariff.**  
                   (WELLAND): **To Knights of Labour.**  
                   (BELLEVILLE): **Legislation for Labour.**  
                   (DESERONTO): **Workingmen and Parties.**  
                   (HAMILTON): **Workingmen and Parties.**
- No. 13.—(HAMILTON): **Provincial Issues—The Religious Cry—Liberals and Catholics.**
- No. 14.—(LINDSAY): **North-West Affairs—Neglect, Delay and Mismanagement—Race and Creed Cries.**

# IRISH HOME RULE.

Facts about the Home Rule Resolution.

LIBERALS ALWAYS FOR SELF GOVERNMENT.

**How the Resolution was defeated. How Home Rule was Lost.**

Hon. Edward Blake, in the course of his speech at Guelph, urged upon the people, as he has done upon other audiences, to frown down the effort now being made to divide the population upon questions of race and creed, and deprecated in strong terms the proposal to violate the constitution by interference in the local affairs of Quebec, with intent to modify institutions subject to the exclusive control of the Province, because of the questionable suggestion that they were prejudicial to the minority in the Province. He proceeded as follows:—

The best way in which we can, if they need our help, benefit that minority, with which those of us who are English and Protestant naturally sympathize, is by setting the example of perfect fair play, tolerance, and more, even generosity, towards those minorities, French or German in nationality or Roman Catholic in religion, which subsist in our own Province. So DOING WE CAN RAISE OUR VOICES, IF NEED SHOULD EXIST, IN FAVOUR OF THE MINORITY IN OTHER PROVINCES WITH THE MOST POWERFUL EFFECT AND WITH THE GREATEST MORAL AUTHORITY. I ask you, as I have asked other audiences, I ask you to

REMEMBER THE GOOD OLD MAXIM,

that example is better than precept. I ask you so to act in your political, your municipal, and your social relations in this regard that if there be a grievance on the part of minorities in other Provinces you may speak as Canadian citizens, as friends and neighbours, in kindly request, with that moral force which, otherwise acting, you could not exert. I do not deny, I maintain your right to extend your sympathy, to exert the force of moral suasion

in favour of any Canadian citizen of whatever Province, if circumstances call for the effort. But

#### DO NOT APPEAL TO COERCIVE METHODS;

do not propose to take away the rights of the Province; do not suggest legislative interference against its will, because if you do you work harm instead of good; you raise a feeling of indignation and resentment on the part of those whose legislative powers are threatened—you lose your only real—the moral power of suasion, without the least hope of success by the other methods you propose. *This principle of Provincial Rights is at the very foundation of our future as a Confederation.* We must recognize a large measure of absolute local liberties as essential, as vital to the nation. I believe the people of Ontario do so; I believe the Liberal party at any rate does so; and I believe that is one reason why the Liberal party is in favour of the exemplification of that principle throughout the Empire and in those islands from whose people most of us are descended. (Cheers.) I observe that Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Costigan have thought fit lately to raise the question of my conduct and to attempt a defence of their own on

#### THE QUESTION OF HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

Sir John Macdonald said:—

“The difference between Mr. Costigan’s resolution and Mr. Blake’s was that the Conservatives wanted to pass a resolution which would be looked upon favourably in England and Ireland, while Mr. Blake desired to introduce a resolution which he knew would not pass, and then he would be able to appeal to the Irishmen of Canada on the ground that the Conservatives were opposed to Home Rule.”

Mr. Costigan said:—

“No benefit whatever could accrue to Ireland or Irishmen by the resurrecting of the question. Every possible prestige which Canada could give it had already been given. . . . As far as he (Mr. Costigan) was concerned, he did not see what benefit whatever it would be to raise the question again. The motion, however, was moved by the leader of the Opposition, and was again substantially carried.”

#### NOW WHAT ARE THE FACTS?

In 1882, Mr. Costigan proposed a motion in favour of Home Rule for Ireland. I supported that motion to the best of my ability, and it passed with apparent unanimity, and, at any rate by an overwhelming majority. In 1886, the question had advanced and a measure was proposed which embodied the true principle of



Home Rule; some exception was taken to certain details, but Mr. Gladstone, who had charge of the Bill, declared that the vote in favour of the second reading was to be regarded as simply an affirmation of the principle of Home Rule, and that the measure, if read a second time, would not be further pushed that session, but that after the prorogation it would be in some particulars reconsidered, and probably amended. It was shown that thus the members and the people would have time to further consider the details, and that in the fall the House might meet and debate, with all the advantage of the intermediate time, thought, and discussion, the amended measure. I saw that

#### THE MOMENT WAS CRITICAL,

that enormous forces were arrayed against the principle of the bill, forces of passion and prejudice, of ignorance and privilege, of party and faction. I saw, too, that the question had reached the point so rapidly in the end, that there were honest doubts, difficulties, and misconceptions which might be removed by time. I felt that it was most important that Mr. Gladstone's hands should be strengthened from every quarter of the civilized world. I saw that other nationalities and other Provinces, and other peoples were acting. I saw them passing resolutions and making representations; I saw that those resolutions and representations were received and answered by Mr. Gladstone; and in a manner which showed how highly he valued, how important he felt, these testimonials of moral support, confidence, and sympathy; and all this strengthened my view that we, too, ought to act. Time passed on. I waited for action on the part of Ministers, especially on the part of him who had before raised the question. I waited in vain. Then I saw published a cable message from Mr. Costigan to Mr. Parnell, informing the Nationalist leader that the Irishmen in the House of Commons who had voted for the resolution of 1882 favoured Home Rule for Ireland still! (Laughter.) Well, I said, this, whatever answer Mr. Parnell's politeness may lead him to give, is

#### REALLY WORSE THAN NOTHING.

Did Mr. Parnell want to know that the Irishmen who had favoured Home Rule in Ireland in 1882 favoured it still? (Great cheering.) Surely that, at any rate, might be inferred! But it was as much as to say that those of other nationalities in the House of Commons, if their opinions were asked again, would not speak with the same voice in 1886. That was the inference! (Loud applause.) *That was worse than nothing.* It is said now that no Parliamentary action was needed; if so, why was the cable needed?

But the cable was thought useful and proper. If so, would not a resolution of the Commons be useful and proper? At length I saw with regret an announcement that *Mr. Costigan had definitely declared that he would not act*. Then, and not till then, I acted. Upon the eve of the second reading of the Bill

#### I BROUGHT FORWARD A PROPOSAL.

That proposal was received with the suggestion that I should defer it for a few days, and in the meantime the Government would consider whether they would accept it or suggest some amendment. They said that after conference we might be able to agree upon a resolution which we could all support. I willingly acceded to this proposal, and expressed an earnest hope that by consultation we should be able to agree upon a unanimous resolution. They knew my views, but they did not communicate theirs, or offer a suggestion, or propose a conference. The time agreed upon for resuming the question came, and I brought forward my original motion, announcing that as nothing had been said upon the subject, I supposed that it was unobjectionable. THEN THEY PROPOSED AN AMENDMENT, A COLOURLESS AMENDMENT, A VAPID AMENDMENT, A WASHED-OUT AMENDMENT, WHICH WAS DESIGNED OBVIOUSLY TO DO AS LITTLE GOOD TO THE CAUSE OF HOME RULE AS POSSIBLE. (Loud cheers.) We heard the Orange Tory element in the House say so. COL. O'BRIEN, THE ORANGE TORY MEMBER FOR MUSKOKA, said:—"I don't like any of these motions or amendments, but I will vote for Mr. Costigan's amendment, because it will do the least harm"—that is, it will do least harm to the cause he favoured, the cause opposed to Home Rule. (Cheers.) I said: I will vote against it, because I WANT THE MOTION TO PASS WHICH WILL DO THE MOST GOOD TO THE CAUSE OF HOME RULE. (Renewed cheering.) The Government carried their amendment against my vote. Weak and halting as it was, when they had carried it, and it was plain that it was the best I could get, I voted for it, as better than nothing. Then I said, "This, though weak, may have some little effect, it may show that we so far countenance Home Rule, if it is sent to Mr. Gladstone, because the very message to him will exhibit some degree of sympathy with him and the cause he represents." That was proposed. What was the Government's reply? THEY SAID:—"We will agree to send it to Mr. Gladstone if you will agree to send it to Lord Salisbury as well." (Laughter.) But, I said, he has spoken only the other day in the most violent terms against Home Rule, and I quoted from some of his speeches then recently delivered. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) The language I quoted was so strong that they dropped their proposal.

# THEY REFUSED TO SEND IT TO MR. GLADSTONE;

they refused to send it to Mr. Parnell; and in the end they determined to send it—to whom do you think they determined to send it as a means of communicating it to the House of Commons?—to Sir Charles Tupper! (Derisive laughter.) Now why did Mr. Costigan not move, and why, when I moved, did he not agree? FOR FEAR OF THE TORY ORANGEMEN OF ONTARIO! He acknowledged that his reason was that a few men were opposed to Home Rule—and you know the men. Yes; the cowardice of one or two Conservative members calling themselves representative Irishmen, and the bigotry of a few fanatic Tory Orange members prevented the voice of Canada from being raised in favour of the principle of that great measure, a measure prompted, as I believe, by the desire for, and tending to accomplish the real unity of the Empire. (Loud and prolonged applause.) The sense in which we were believed to speak, the way in which what we said and did was understood, was shown by the disappointment of those who were the friends of Home Rule and the rejoicings of those who were its enemies. (Applause.) Those who were engaged in opposing Home Rule said it was a very good thing that my motion was defeated and that Mr. Costigan's amendment prevailed—a good thing it was for their cause, but

## BAD FOR HOME RULE!

Those who were in favour of Home Rule, as for example, Mr. O'Brien, the late member for Tyrone, said that it was a cause for great regret that Mr. Costigan's amendment had carried, and that the motion I presented was lost. Yet I find Sir John Macdonald and Mr. Costigan declaring to the electors of the country that their motion was as well calculated, or better calculated, to accomplish the object in view as mine, and I find it alleged that my motives were all that was vile, while theirs were all that was excellent. (Laughter.) My fears were realized;

## THE BILL WAS LOST;

lost by a narrow majority; by a majority we might have helped to turn. The election was precipitated. The people were told Canada had refused its voice for Home Rule. The Government was defeated. I deeply regret the circumstances which prevented the Canadian Commons from speaking what I believe is the voice of the vast majority of the people of Canada. (Cheers.) I regret it in the interest of the Empire at large. I know not how soon or in what shape may come the issue of the struggle. But I know



that if the second reading of the Bill had been carried, the question had been adjourned and the details had been reconsidered, if there had been a few months for the people to discuss and understand the whole matter; and if after a fall session the election had been held, the result, in my judgment, would have been different from that which has actually ensued. Had sufficient time been given by that second reading, I believe the fortune of the question would have been changed, and

#### HOME RULE WOULD HAVE BEEN ASSURED.

(Great and prolonged cheering.) I hope and trust it will come still. (Loud applause.) I hope and trust so in the interest of the Empire at large, in the interest of the two islands, in the interest of Canada, which is so deeply concerned in the quenching of the fires of discord and alienation born out of wrong and injustice, fires which have burned so long and so fiercely and with such deplorable results on this as well as on the other side of the water, and which can be extinguished only by the establishment of a just and reasonable control by the Irish people over their local affairs. I believe the best opportunity Canada ever had, the best opportunity she ever may have, to help in the accomplishment of that great Imperial object was the opportunity I offered to the House of Commons, and which that House, by the advice of Mr. Costigan and Sir John Macdonald, Mr. Bowell and Sir Hector Langevin, unhappily declined. (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

---

### RACE AND REVENGE.

---

ATROCIOUS ATTEMPT TO AROUSE THE GERMANS IN CANADA—  
FIREBRAND UTTERANCES OF A SUBSIDIZED TORY ORGAN  
—MR. BLAKE APPEALS TO UNITED AND PRO-  
GRESSIVE CANADA.

---

Mr. Blake, at Berlin, referred to the effort to stir up race and religious prejudices for the advantage of the Conservative party. Continuing this theme, he said:—

I regret to find that here you are not exempt from other and special efforts of the same kind. While all the English are called

upon to unite against the French, while all the Protestants are called upon to unite against the Catholics, while it is charged that from an English and a Protestant point of view our institutions are being threatened by the French and the Catholics, I find that in the German paper called the *Berlin Free Press* a like course has been adopted in

#### APPEALING TO THE GERMANS

of Canada. And I hold the Ministerial party to be directly responsible for its utterances, by which they profit, for this among other reasons, because I understand that it owes the breath of its life to the fact that the proprietor has secured from the Dominion Government, at the instance of the Tories of Waterloo, a rich contract to print an immigration pamphlet—as a subsidy on which to found the paper. That I believe to be the basis of the *Free Press*. (Applause.) The *Free Press*, in a recent editorial article, speaks to the Germans in their own tongue as follows:—

“SHALL THE GERMANS IN CANADA ALLOW THEMSELVES TO BE SHAMEFULLY TYRANIZED OVER BY THE FRENCH?”

“No people on the face of the earth are more ambitious, more aggressive, more overbearing, and more desirous of ruling over everybody than the French. This is not a mere newspaper assertion, but a well-known historical fact. Even at the present time history shudders when it relates the deeds of devastation which the French perpetrated with the most refined cruelty over a hundred years ago in the German districts of Alsace and Lorraine, yes, and in the entire country watered by the Rhine. Napoleon I. went through all the countries of Europe, burning, plundering, and murdering everywhere, until at last, on St. Helena's Island, his conquering spirit was subdued. In 1870 Napoleon III., with the most unheard of effrontery, declared war with Germany, because that nation refused to dance while France was whistling. These Frenchmen had forgotten how Germany wielded the sword in her wars of freedom. In 1870 Germany was once more called upon to bring these aggressive Frenchmen to their senses. They brought their barbarian Turks and Zouaves from the wilds of Africa, and placed them against the honourable soldiers and children of Germany; and the lesson administered to them by Frederick the Great was repeated then. True, they were defeated, but at what price—many thousands of Germany's noblest sons saturated the soil of France with their blood, until these Frenchmen, humiliated to the dust, acknowledged they were conquered, and humbly promised to remain peaceful. This was scarcely fifteen years ago, and again these Frenchmen are howling for revenge and thirsting for blood. Everyone who is in any way familiar with history knows what Germany has had to endure at the hands of the French, who, in their aggressiveness, are ever ready to quarrel and go to war. Everyone knows how much blood has been spilled in Germany, and how much misery has been caused there through the French. Every page of history shows that for centuries past France has been Germany's greatest enemy—that the people of France bear Germany a boundless hatred, and that their only desire is to destroy and annihilate them. Such is the state of things across the ocean. But Germany does not fear France.

"A Frenchman remains the same all the world over. Everywhere he wants to be master and tyrannize over others. A Frenchman's ambition knows no bounds; he wants the whole world to be at his feet.

"Here in Canada just now they are at their old tricks. They want everything to go as they desire it. They expect all other nationalities represented here to bow to their wishes. They want to be masters in Canada—Englishmen, Scotchmen, Irishmen, Germans, must be their obedient servants, and humbly submit to all the demands of these French gentlemen.

"Now, we ask you, Germans, did you leave the Fatherland and cross the ocean to be the slaves of Quebec Frenchmen? We ask you, shall the Germans in Canada shamefully submit to be tyrannized over by the French in Canada? We say No; with all the strength that lies within us, we say No, and we trust that this No will find an echo in every German heart in Canada."

A second article contains the following:—

"We would like to see the figure Parliament would cut if Mr. Kranz were to address the House in German. Nevertheless the Frenchmen can speak their own language in Parliament. They have acquired that right through their sheer impudence. More than that, English-Canada annually pays thousands of dollars to have all state papers and official documents printed in French as well as in English. We have yet to see the first Canadian official document printed in the German language, yet the French have everything printed in their language at the expense of the country. Why? Because they are shameless and aggressive Frenchmen. Even their children are educated in the French language at the State's expense. . . . Why should we produce more proof to show that the Quebec Frenchmen are acting as though they were living in the heart of France? They never give way to anyone. They want everybody to submit to these lordly Frenchmen."

A third article is entitled "How the Canadian Germans can assist in checking the growing aggression of the French Canadians," and from it I quote the following:—

"The contest in Haldimand is being fought over Riel. In other contests important political or economic questions are introduced, but in Haldimand it is Riel and nothing but Riel. The Frenchmen and their friends say the Conservative party should not have allowed Riel to be hung; the Conservatives say, 'We could not do otherwise. The welfare of the country demanded his death.' The electors of Haldimand are now called upon to decide whether the Conservative party are to be defeated because they allowed Riel to be hung, or whether the Frenchmen and their friends shall be defeated and a check put to their aggressiveness. Since the Reformers have allied themselves to the Frenchmen they must accept the verdict which will be pronounced upon them. Let him who approves of this French aggression, who is satisfied to have the French rule and tyrannize over this country—yes, and over us Germans—let him, we say, vote for the Reform party. But let he who thinks that the execution of Riel was just, he who wants the French to have no more power in Canada than the English, Scotch, or Germans, he who thinks it time to check the overbearing ambition of the French, let him vote for the Conservative party.

"We write this regardless of party. But since the Reformers have allied themselves to the Frenchmen because that arch-scoundrel was hung, since they both wish to make political capital out of Riel's execution, nothing re-

mains for us Germans to do but to go with the Conservative party, to vote for the Conservative candidates and say that Riel richly merited his death and that we Germans will not submit to French domination.

"When the Reformers try to scare us Germans with Riel's ghost and place us under the yoke of the Quebec Frenchmen, then we must look to the Conservatives for help, and keep them in power in spite of these Frenchmen. If the Frenchmen think they can rule this land, we Germans must let them know that we are here. The only thing to be considered is this:—If we want to go with Riel and the French then let us vote for the Reformers, but if we would go against Riel and the French, then let us vote for the Conservatives. We ask all the Canadian Germans in Haldimand, Welland, Waterloo, and wherever they may be, to vote against Riel and the Frenchmen and for the Conservative party. We Germans will not have French domination in Canada."

I want the public at large to know of these articles. I declare that a more fiendish attempt to arouse long-buried animosities, and to disturb the social relations of this mixed community, and

#### TO DESTROY THE POSSIBILITIES OF A PEACEFUL AND HARMONIOUS PROGRESS

never has, so far as I know, occurred. (Cheers.) One of the Grecian peoples in old days made a law and decree that the trophies which were to be erected in memory of successful war should be made of wood, because that was a perishable material, and that it should be criminal for any to repair such a trophy. It was a wise and a humane provision. But in this civilized and Christian age the wrongs and bitterness of a contest waged near a century ago and 4,000 miles away are to be brought across the water and revived and reanimated to fill the minds of our peaceful, industrious, law-abiding, law-loving, loyal, contented German population with hate against a very large proportion of the people of Canada, their French fellow-citizens. (Cheers.) I can conceive of

#### NOTHING MORE NEFARIOUS

than this attempt. (Loud applause.) What have the Germans of Ontario, many of whom are descended from the Pennsylvania Dutch who emigrated so long ago, many of whom come from Alsace, with its varied fortunes, many of whom come from Old Germany, what, I say, have these in this new country to do with the wars and losses of near a hundred years ago in Europe?

Are they going to visit on the French of Canada, whose ancestors settled here ages before these lamentable events, the quarrels in the time of the first Napoleon or of the third Napoleon between France and Germany?

**HE IS A COMMON ENEMY WHO SEEKS TO DIVIDE CANADIAN  
FROM CANADIAN**

on such grounds, and to arouse by such language prejudice and hate on the part of the Germans towards the French.

Is it Christian? Is it in consonance with the doctrines of the Gospel of peace, charity, and love that such an effort should be made? I denounce it as a public crime, and I call on all honest men, on all Christian men, on all good citizens, on all who value Canadian unity and the future of the land we love, to join in the reprobation of these efforts. (Loud and long continued applause.) And on you especially I call, inhabitants of Waterloo, whose historic name, though drawn from the scene of a great battle between English, French, and Germans, no longer, thank God, stirs the pulse of exultation on one side or of humiliation on the other, but is associated with peaceful and prosperous progress here—on you I call, to whom this wicked appeal has been so lately made, to show your abhorrence of the act, and to prove to its authors that you know your duty to our common country, and that, knowing, you will perform it to the full. (Great applause.)

---

**MALTREATMENT OF THE INDIANS.**

**THE EFFECT OF THE STARVATION POLICY—FAMINE, DISEASE, AND MISERY, AND DEATH—"CALLOUS AND CRUEL NEGLECT."**

Mr. Blake, in his speech at Galt, said:—

"I have been amazed to see the statements made by Sir John Macdonald and others with reference to the treatment of the Indians. For years the newspapers and the Parliamentary papers have contained statements indicating the unhappy state of the Indians and the mismanagement of their affairs. For years we have called attention to these. On 15th April last Mr. M. C. Cameron, M.P., brought forward in the House of Commons many of these statements, official and otherwise, extending over a period of years from 1879 onward, tending to show instances of cruel neglect and maladministration.

On 10th June last Sir John Macdonald declared that the evidence in reply to Mr. Cameron had been obtained from the North-



West, and had then been in his hands for some days, and that this evidence, disproving the statements which he declared false, would be printed and distributed to the members of the House and to the electorate without delay. It has been further stated that a commission would be appointed to investigate the whole question of the

#### DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT.

But there has been no publication of these exculpatory statements, which have been in Sir John Macdonald's hands for many months, nor has a commission issued to investigate into these affairs. And now Sir John has made several speeches, in which he has touched upon Indian affairs. I find that at Belleville he said, as reported in the *Mail*:—

"When the buffalo became extinct the Government could not allow the red men to starve, and although there was no treaty obligation, he, as Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, asked Parliament for a grant to feed them. Sensational reporters, in the interest of the Opposition, had gone among the Indians and asked them if they were hungry—and an Indian, by the way, is always hungry—and of course they said they were starving, not meaning, as the reporters thought, that they were in need of food, but that they were starving for tobacco, or tea, or other luxuries. Grit speakers had used these statements, and naturally he felt indignant at them."

(Laughter.) At Winchester Springs he said:—

"I am supposed to be rather a good-hearted old man, but if you believe the attacks made on me by the Opposition press, I have starved out the whole of the Indian population of the North-West. I have gone through that country and have met the tribes, who have presented me with congratulatory messages, calling me their great father. I have charge of them as Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs. Every one of them would like to be a little better than he is to-day, no doubt, but the Indians are the most spoiled and petted people in the world. . . . Sometimes it did occur that it was impossible for the contractors to supply fresh beef, and these poor Indians had to take bacon instead. In Scotland and Ireland, and even in England, many a poor farmer had to be satisfied with bacon or meat, not every day, but perhaps two or three times a week, and yet the Government was blamed because they did not provide fresh beefsteak for the Indians every morning." (Laughter.)

At Belleville he said:—

"The Indians of that part of the Dominion (the North-West), had not only been well treated, but they had been spoiled."

Mr. Chapleau, in his speech at London, said:—

"Ask whether the Canadian Government has wrongly administered the North-West, and they will say that the Canadian Government has treated those territories as a good living father would treat his children. We have

treated that part of the Dominion with the utmost care. If there is any fault to be found with the Government in that regard, it is perhaps that we have shown so much solicitude for its interests."

Now, Mr. Chairman, ladies, and gentlemen, the Indian question is a large one, with several branches. It includes the questions of bad appointments, of official neglect, incompetency, and tyranny, of wanton extravagance, of fraud, of unfit and inadequate supplies, of breach of agreements, of gross immorality on the part of Government officers and of starvation. I cannot deal with all these questions to-night. I must omit reference to all but one, to which I wish to call your attention. I wish to deal with the question of the

#### STARVATION OF THESE SPOILED, PETTED INDIANS,

whose only complaint was that they did not get their fresh beef-steak every morning, and who were hungry only for tea, tobacco, and other luxuries. (Applause.) A paper was brought down to the House last session, comprising official correspondence, not, you will observe, statements of missionaries or members of Council, or others, whose evidence we are asked to ignore, but statements of Government officials. From these reports I give you a few extracts.

W. Anderson, Indian Agent, writes from Edmonton, April, 29th, 1882:—

"From Victoria I shipped relief supplies to Whitefish Lake and Lac la Biche, as Mr. Hardisty had a few days previously reported that the Indians at those places were starving, as the catch of fish had failed, and the early frost of last year had ruined a part of their grain crop and caused the loss of many potatoes by freezing them in the ground."

Commissioner Irvine writes from Fort Walsh on 23rd Sept., 1882:—

"I have also to inform you that on my return from Qu'Appelle I found some 2,000 Indians here. They are all in a starving and wretched condition for want of clothing . . . . In the present starving condition of the Indians I fear, if no food is given them, that they may hereafter commit depredations which will bring them into collision with the force."

Inspector Norman writes from Fort Walsh on 2nd October, 1882:—

"There are at present three hundred lodges of Cree Indians camped here. These lodges average about eight souls, making a total of about 2,400 souls. They are in an utter state of destitution, and are merely existing in a semi-state of starvation."

Comptroller White telegraphs, under date of October 19th, 1882:—

"Over two thousand Indians here almost naked and on the verge of starvation. Weather cold and snow on ground. Have been among them for two days. Am satisfied many will perish unless early assistance rendered."

It is contended indeed that these Indians were properly starved because they had gone to Fort Walsh after being told that they would not be paid there, but on their reserves.

I DO NOT AGREE THAT THIS IS A REASON FOR STARVING THEM.

It is to be remembered that starvation inflicts the penalty on the wives and children, as well as on the man; indeed, it is mainly on the wives and children that it falls, and I confess it is repugnant to my sense of humanity to agree to a policy of starving a tribe for such a reason.

As I stated in Parliament, I do not believe in torture by famine.

But the Indian men were not so much to blame. They had been accustomed to resort to Fort Walsh. They were, I suppose, told that Fort Walsh was to be abandoned, and therefore they were to be paid elsewhere.

But Fort Walsh was not abandoned; the purpose was changed, and, Fort Walsh being retained, not unnaturally the Indians supposed they were to continue the custom. In support of this view, I quote Commissioner Dewdney's letter to Colonel Irvine, of 27th October, 1882:—

"I think it is very unfortunate that the post at Fort Walsh had not been abandoned this summer, as agreed upon last winter in Ottawa. The Indians will not now believe that the post is to be abandoned, and we will have considerable difficulty in inducing them to leave. . . . I trust that you will recollect that over and over again you have been instructed to inform the Indians that the payments would not be made, neither would the Indians be fed, at Fort Walsh. This was done in anticipation of the post being abandoned, as agreed upon."

Inspector Norman wrote on 1st February, 1885:—

"I have informed Surgeon Miller that it is not in my power to increase the quantity of food to the Indians, as my instructions from the Indian Commissioner are to keep the Indians at Fort Walsh on 'starvation allowance.'"

Dr. Edwards wrote on February 7th, 1884, and, mark you, this was with reference to Indians on their reserve, not to those away:—

"In Piapot's camp I prescribed for 35 and in the Assiniboine camp for 37 Indians, in all 72, suffering from phthisis, bronchitis, hemorrhage from the

lungs, dysentery, etc., etc., and starvation, if the last can be recorded as a disease. I find that in the last three months 13 deaths have taken place in each reserve, in all 26, a very heavy death rate; and, from all I can gather, death has been accelerated, if not immediately caused, by the

#### SCANT SUPPLY OF FOOD

served out to these Indians. At the present time this condition of starvation is more evident among the Crees, as the Assiniboines have lately obtained supplies for cutting wood. I saw several children in the Assiniboine camp worn and wasted, and unless properly fed must die in a few days. The old Medicine Man asked me if I could give him some medicine to have by him that would be helpful when the Indians fainted, as from their scanty rations many of them suffer in that way. It may not come within my province to report this condition of starvation, but I am well satisfied that if they were sufficiently fed there would be less tendency to illness among them. I may also add that from the way they have been allowed to starve a firm determination was expressed by both Piapot and Jack that as soon as they could travel they would forsake the reserve and go west again. . . . Of course a fatal termination is accelerated when they are not sufficiently fed."

Agent McDonald wrote from Indian Head, 20th February, 1884 :—

"What the chief and a few of the leading Indians said was that the cause of their present illness was from accidents met with years back. The want of fresh meat has reduced them to a semi-state of starvation; while in their weak state they are unable to eat bacon. . . . Little Blanket, head man, knows he is dying. He knows it is not through starvation, but thinks if he had a little fresh meat, tea and sugar, he would last longer. . . . Long Lodge informed me that it was not the want of food, in the first place, that has laid prostrate several of our Indians; it was sickness, but had fresh meat, tea and sugar been issued to them while ill they would not be so low. They would have been well before this, and going about. Those who are sick are not able to eat bacon. Rabbits we cannot get, as we have no ammunition. . . . A young man from the chief's hut looks as if he was starving. I got them to take off his clothes. I must confess he looked like a skeleton, and I would have supposed the cause was the want of food, had I not seen bacon and bannocks in the hut, and the father and mother in very healthy condition. I had a piece of bannock sliced and roasted in front of the fire, and a little bacon grease spread over it. The poor lad seemed to relish it. . . . The chief . . . cannot say what the Indians who have horses will do in the spring, if not better fed than at present, and particularly when spring work commences. He fears many will move off to live on game. . . . From inquiries and what I have seen I am of the opinion that the present miserable state of some of the Indians at the Indian Head Reserve is, in the first place, through the neglect of relatives and friends, their not being properly nursed when they first fell ill; and, secondly, from the want of more nourishing or palatable food than bacon. While at Piapot's he told me a young man from the Assiniboine camp called on the evening of the 14th inst., and reported that Mr. Thompson had been on their reserve and told his chief that he heard 'the Reader' say :—Never mind, there are a great many Indians yet on the earth. When spring comes we will make it sharp for the white man."

Then there are statements quoted by Mr. Cameron, covering, as I said, a period of years. From these I extract a few, only those of the officials, omitting all reference to the other important evidence.

Commissioner Irvine says, speaking of a band :—

"For a considerable time they made no demands for aid from the Government, but as the cold weather came on, being very poorly clad, and insufficiently supplied with food, they experienced much hardship from exposure and starvation."

Mr. Herchmer, speaking of the Sioux bands, says :—

"A great deal of sickness has visited them lately, owing to the want of fresh meat."

W. Pocklington, speaking of the Stoney Indians, says :—

"During last winter there was a great deal of distress among them for want of clothing, many of them not having a blanket to cover their nakedness."

Commissioner McLeod says :—

"I have experienced great difficulty with the distress and suffering, applications for relief being constantly made to me by the starving bands of Indians."

Again the Commissioner says :—

"A Stoney Mountain Indian and his family have been without food for many days."

Superintendent Walsh, in his report says :—

"Hunger and suffering prevailed. In some places persons became so reduced as to be unable to help themselves. The want of food followed by disease caused an epidemic, which marked its results by the many graves now to be seen in Wood Mountain."

Mr. Herchmer says in his report :—

"During the winter I visited the Pas reserves a number of times, and witnessed the actual condition of the Indians. For three months, from January to March—many of those in the Pas Birch River and Pas Mountains suffered keenly. It was impossible to supply food as it was actually needed, for there was not sufficient in the district."

Mr. Pocklington, in his report, says :—

"In January, while visiting the Piegan reserve, I received a letter from Lieut.-Col. McLeod that 75 Stoney were in Pincher Creek in a starving condition. I started for their camp at once, and found them in reality starving, except for assistance given them by Col. McLeod and other residents."



Mr. Wadsworth, the Superintendent, says:—

"The flour and bacon received as supplies were bad, and the flour received by the Indians at Battleford had become lumpy."

Mr. Wadsworth, speaking of the Indians of the Sekaskoots, says:—

"I could get no account of the supplies sent in by the contractors or the Government."

He further says:—

"The flour received by those Indians only averaged 93 pounds per sack."

Again, speaking of Poundmaker's band, he says:—

"The flour was inferior and of light weight."

Mr. Herchmer, in his report, says:—

"A great deal of sickness has visited them lately, owing to the want of fresh meat. The Indians under treaty received in 1884-5 \$15,290.92 worth of pork, and \$1,288.45 worth of beef, although it is known that beef is life to the Indian, while salt pork is disease and death to him."

And again he says:—

"At Oak River, 11 men have died out of 88 heads of families, and 17 children under three years old. This is very distressing, and is hard to account for—the change of diet, owing to the failure of hunting, and scrofula, being probably the cause."

And so, gentlemen, *year after year starvation shows its ghastly face*. And yet we are told by the First Minister, who is also Superintendent-General of Indian Affairs, that the Indians have been only too well treated; that they have been petted and spoiled; that it was only for luxuries they craved; and that it was only the want of the daily fresh beefsteak for breakfast of which they had to complain. (Loud and prolonged cheering.)

---

### SOME EXPLANATIONS AT ORANGEVILLE.

---

At Orangeville Mr. Blake, after some preliminary remarks, said:—I value the privilege of discussing public affairs before

these great gatherings of my fellow countrymen and women; and I recognize the attendant responsibility. It is my aim, as it is my duty, to state to you

#### THE TRUTH AS I HAVE RECEIVED IT,

to give you what, in my judgment and conscience, are accurate statements of fact, and just inferences from those statements; to lead aright, and not astray, those whom I am permitted to affect by my words. Now I take the very earliest opportunity of making reference to some criticisms which I have seen to-day on my recent speech in Galt on one branch of Sir John Macdonald's Indian policy. I pointed out that he was declaring in Ontario that the Indians in the North-West were spoiled and petted, that they were "starving" only for luxuries, as tea and tobacco, and that their complaint was that they did not get a fresh beefsteak every day for breakfast. I declared that, laying aside for the moment all other evidence, however weighty, the official papers lamentably disproved this statement, and established that numbers of the Indians had been exposed to starvation. I proceeded to the proof. The first and gravest and most detailed proofs I gave were from original documents supplied to me, and from which I gave, on my own responsibility, lengthy extracts. They dealt mainly with the condition at Fort Walsh and at Indian Head. *They of themselves amply justified my declaration.* I proceeded then to give a number of brief extracts as quoted by Mr. M. C. Cameron, M.P., in a speech he made in Parliament last session. These quotations, I informed my audience, I made from that speech, which I gave as my authority. It was ample authority. It had been made in Parliament, and though we sat for about two months afterwards the accuracy of the quotations which I drew from it was not, so far as I had observed, denied. It had been made in April last, and, so far as I had observed, the accuracy of these quotations had not been up to this time denied by the press. It had been made by

#### AN ABLE AND PAINSTAKING PUBLIC MAN

on whose care and thoroughness the Liberal party had, as we have to-day, implicit confidence. I am glad to notice that the *Hamilton Spectator* uses this language to me:—

There are few men in Canada who believe that you would intentionally make a statement you do not believe to be true. The *Spectator* holds that you would not do so; and that if you do make an incorrect statement through inaccurate or insufficient information, or through error of judgment, you will, on presentation of proper evidence that you are wrong, make public

correction of the error. You are a public and a busy man. You are accustomed to cover a great deal of ground in your public addresses, and it is impossible you should be able to verify for yourself every quotation you use, and every occurrence you cite.

But now it is alleged that a number of Mr. Cameron's quotations are inaccurate and untrue; some of them are alleged to be very grossly inaccurate; others, so far as I can judge, not materially so. I conjecture as to one or two cases that Mr. Cameron's own remarks must have been erroneously printed in the report of his speech as quotations. But on this, as on the rest, I am uninformed. I leave to Mr. Cameron the task which properly belongs to him, of answering these charges and vindicating the propriety of his conduct; and I believe that he will in due time satisfactorily establish or explain his position. I have neither the time, nor the right, nor the means, nor the inclination, to enter into that controversy. This being so, I feel bound to ask you to eliminate from the discussion meantime any of Mr. Cameron's quotations, whose substantial accuracy has been challenged; and *I am quite content to rest my case on the extracts made on my own responsibility, and on the unchallenged extracts of Mr. Cameron.* I grieve to say

THEY ABUNDANTLY PROVE MY POSITION,

and furnish a shocking contrast between Sir John Macdonald's Indian policy, as exemplified by the official documents, and his policy as stated in his late speeches, between the actual starving condition of many of these poor Indians, and the glowing picture of their state which he lately gave to his audiences in Ontario. (Applause.)

---

## EFFECT OF MALADMINISTRATION AT CUT KNIFE.

---

### USELESS MOUNTAIN GUNS.

---

In the course of a speech at Pembroke, dealing with North-West maladministration and the rebellion, Mr. BLAKE said:—You recollect the excitement into which we were all plunged by the war, and the solicitude with which we followed the movements of our gallant Volunteers in the field. You recollect, among other stirring incidents, the

## ATTACK UPON POUNDMAKER

at Cut Knife. That was an advance by the Volunteers upon an Indian post, a movement in which the Indians had, in some respects, decided advantages. I have always held that the duty laid upon us of making ample preparations to repress an Indian rising—an ever-present possibility—included the obligation to place ourselves in a predominant position, so far as arms and munitions, and the resource of modern warfare could effect that result; and that we should demonstrate to the savage tribes our power, so as to excite a wholesome dread of our resources, thus at once doing our best to prevent a rising, and, if unhappily our efforts should be in vain, doing our best to secure a favourable issue to the rising. *In this view, when a member of the late Government, I suggested that we should procure some of the light mountain guns suitable to the country and the conditions, so as to be ready for emergencies, and also that we should direct that at the great assemblages of the tribes for treaty payments and so forth, an opportunity should be taken by the Mounted Police to perform drill and practice with this artillery, so that the Indians might see our predominance in this respect and be wholesomely alarmed. The guns were bought and were, I believe, used in the way proposed and with very excellent and pacific effects. At length came the time to use them in the field.* The day of Cut Knife came. Our young men were gathered together and sent forth on their dreadful errand. In that affair our main dependence was the guns. The Indians whom we were about to attack were on their own ground. They had the advantage of position. They were skilled in their own style of warfare, and they were trained to fight under cover and behind trees. Our superiority lay in the guns. We brought into action a Gatling gun and two of these 4-pounder mountain guns of the Mounted Police; and they rightly constituted the very centre of our attack, the Gatling gun in the middle with a 7-pounder on either side; and the force was marshalled on either side and behind these guns. **VERY EARLY IN THE ENGAGEMENT ONE OF THE MOUNTAIN GUNS WAS DISABLED BY THE CARRIAGE BREAKING, and so it was practically out of the fight. Not long afterwards the other gun became similarly disabled.** The troops thus lost their great advantage; it became advisable to retire, and they did retire, having been exposed, both in the fight and in the retreat, to danger and loss, and having failed to reap the expected advantage through the failure of the guns. Let me prove my statement by an authority which I suppose my Tory friends will still respect a little. Here is the account given in the *Mail* of the affair:—

"Col. Otter had intended advancing right in upon the tepees to the front, but one of the 7-pounders was disabled by the breaking of the gun carriage, and it was not deemed advisable to push on. As a matter of fact, our small arms were not of much use, the two guns being our principal reliance. The Gatling did good work in clearing the groves and clumps, but the moment the enemy dropped down into the coulees it was of little more use than our rifles. The shrapnel of "B" Battery did most of the damage, and the disabling of one of the guns was, under such circumstances, a serious misfortune."

Again the *Mail*, on the 19th May, publishes the following further account:—

"At last it seemed as though the ammunition of the Indians was being exhausted, and Col. Otter decided on making a rush to the tepees and burning the whole encampment. There were just two courses open to him, namely, either to withdraw his troops or make a grand rush for their camp, but here fate settled the question. The trail of one of the 7-pounders broke as the gun was discharged, rendering it, of course, useless. The other was cracked some time before, and had been strengthened by a piece of 2-inch oak, which was bolted on the lower side. But the constant firing had loosened this, and every time the gun was discharged it jumped out of the trunnion holes. In fact, it was a race between the gun and the gunners. The former jumped back every time it was discharged, and the latter had to follow it and carry it back to its place again. It would have been folly to attempt to destroy the tepees without the guns, and so Col. Otter decided on withdrawing."

Now, gentlemen, that is the statement. I think I have proved to you the importance of the guns, that they were our main dependence, that

#### WE FAILED OF VICTORY,

were forced to retire, and ran serious risks of grave disaster by reason of these failures. But some Conservative may say: "What? Do you mean to blame the Government, the people at Ottawa, so far away, because there was a failure in two gun carriages? That would be a most outrageous thing to do. If you could show they knew of their condition, and were responsible for it, it would be different." Perhaps it may seem so to some, but I must say I think the Government is called, under the circumstances, to explain how it was that the carriages were in this condition, and to show that they were not to blame. My Tory friend, however, may say: "Oh! it was an inevitable misfortune; these accidents will happen even to the best regulated guns." Well, we will see. I am not going to ask you to rest your opinion upon inference, or upon conjecture or probability, or upon the want of explanation, or upon anything else than the official reports brought down by the Ministers themselves, and



## OUT OF THEIR OWN MOUTHS

I will prove their culpability. On 1st February, 1882—mark you, this engagement took place on 5th May, 1885—on 1st February, 1882, Commissioner Irvine, of the Mounted Police, sent a report to the Minister in these words:—

“The carriages and limbers for the 7-pounder guns are fast becoming unserviceable. These carriages were constructed at Fort Walsh some years ago, under the direction of Inspector Neale. Considering the material at that officer's command, the carriages and limbers have proved most successful. I would, however, recommend that new ones be purchased, of the pattern lately approved by the Imperial authorities.”

So that, you see, the minister *knew then* that the carriages and limbers were fast becoming unserviceable, and that they should be renewed. The Indian population was discontented. No one knew when they might rise; the matter pressed, but nothing was done; the new material was not supplied, and the guns were left in their deplorable condition. A year elapsed. On 1st January, 1883, Commissioner Irvine reports again:—

“I would remind you that the carriages and limbers of the 7-pounder mountain guns are fast becoming unserviceable. I recommend that new ones be purchased, of the pattern lately approved by the Imperial authorities.”

The reminder was ineffectual. Some inquiry seems to have been made about cost, but nothing was done. Another year of risk was run.

On the 1st January, 1884, the Commissioner reported for the third time, as follows:—

“I have previously reported that the carriages and limbers of the 7-pounder guns are virtually unserviceable—”

So that it is stated now that they are virtually unserviceable, as indeed one would infer from the previous language used in the mild sense customary in speaking of a condition of a military force.

“—are virtually unserviceable, and last year I recommended that carriages and limbers of the Imperial pattern be purchased. On close inquiry it was ascertained that such purchase would have entailed a very considerable expense. Carriages and limbers suitable for our purposes can be manufactured in this country at much smaller cost than would ensue were a purchase made from England. The supply officer at headquarters has now the required material for manufacture, and I trust that next summer may find us in possession of sufficient skilled labour to make carriages and limbers in this country.”

Another year elapsed—yes, and four months of the fourth year—but, so far as we can find,

#### NOTHING WAS DONE.

For all this time the Minister had known that the carriages and limbers for these guns were unserviceable; he had known that the Indians might rise at any moment, yet he had not remedied the defects, and in the end he sent our gallant volunteers into action with these unserviceable carriages, creating these serious results, with all the more serious possibilities which you can perceive. On his head I place the consequences which did ensue, and the danger of the infinitely more disastrous consequences which might have ensued from one of the clearest cases of administrative incapacity and neglect it has ever been my lot to notice. That Minister is Sir John Macdonald. (Loud and prolonged cheers.) And, mark you, this is but a sample. I could proceed from one topic to another; I could take the North-West Militia management; the Indian management; the Half-breed management, in divers flagrant instances; the white settlers' management. I could go from branch to branch, from department to department, and cull instances of glaring neglect, productive of great evils. (Cheers.)

(6)

nd  
aat  
ied  
nto  
re-  
ve.  
the  
ght  
in-  
hat  
ers.)  
one  
age-  
t, in  
I  
ent,  
vils.